The Shakespeare Newsletter

Vol. VII, No. 5 | *"Knowing I lov'd my books, he furnish'd me . . ."* | November, 1957

Canadian Festival Continues Successes In New Theatre

Hamlet and *Twelfth Night* combined to make the Stratford Canada Shakespearean Festival's fourth season an unqualified success. Over 160,000 attended performances of the two works in the new theatre during the ten week season which closed September 7. Box office receipts exceeded other seasons by at least $150,000.

Michael Langham's production of *Hamlet* was "spirited and modern" according to Brooks Atkinson of the *N. Y. Times* Christopher Plummer played a "crisp, agile Hamlet" at the center of a whirling production of "banners, alarm bells, cannon and warlike flourishes." Douglas Campbell played Claudius; Joy Lafleur, Gertrude; Frances Hyland, Ophelia; and William Hutt, Polonius.

Siobhan McKenna as Viola and Douglas Rain as Malvolio in *Twelfth Night* won critical praise with Atkinson calling Rain's Malvolio "the finest piece of acting in the performance." Tyrone Guthrie directed and made great use of a "heavy thumping trap door in the center of the stage," in keeping with the buffoonery of Douglas Campbell's Sir Toby Belch and Christopher Plummer's "gangling, chuckle headed Sir Andrew Aguecheek."

A Soviet color movie of *Twelfth Night* was also presented at the Festival as a part of the seventeen nation International Film program. It was produced at Lenfilm studios by director Yakov Fried and starred leading Russian actors.

The Third Annual Season of Music at the Festival presented the CBC Orchestra, a production of Benjamin Britten's *The Turn of the Screw, and* Duke Ellington's Orchestra playing Ellington's "Such Sweet Thunder" (*MND,* IV. i. 122) written especially for the Festival.

The Company is currently touring Canada and the U. S.

Artistic Director Langham announced that the 1958 season will be expanded to twelve weeks with a program of three plays.

Shakespeare Institute at San Jose

San Jose State College offered a three-unit Shakespeare study course and presented *As You Like It* and *Macbeth* during its Shakespeare Institute last summer. The plays were presented in the fifth week of the six-week session. Directed by Elizabeth M. Loeffler and James H. Clancy, respectively, the productions were offered as an integral part of the Institute and relied upon enrolled students for the production and acting companies.

During the preceeding weeks, films of *MND, Hamlet, H V* and *Julius Caesar* were shown; *Romeo and Juliet* and *Richard III* were offered following the production week.

Director of the Institute, James O. Wood announced that a total of 94 students were enrolled in the undergraduate and graduate sections.

ASFTA Triumphs In 3rd Season At Stratford, Connecticut

The American Shakespeare Festival Theatre and Academy at Stratford, Connecticut, attracted over 150,000 theatregoers during its third season, to set a new attendance record. The previous mark was 95,000, set in the 1956 season. The 1463-seat Festival Theatre was sold out for the better part of the twelve week season. Popular demand was so great that an extra week of performances had to be added, according to Artistic Director John Houseman.

Othello, with Alfred Drake as Iago and Earle Hyman in the title role opened the season on June 26. Although terming the acting "agreeable and intelligent" Brooks Atkinson of the N. Y. Times felt that the production lacked the "fire, passion and size of Shakespearean tragedy."

John McClain of the N. Y. Journal-American observed that the production itself was "the most successful compromise between a classical presentation and modern American Theatrical skills" possible.

Staging was by John Houseman.

The production which received the greatest critical acclaim was *M of V* with Morris Carnovsky and Katherine Hepburn. Henry Hewes of *Saturday Review* said it was the "occasion for the best performance in the three-year history of the festival." Carnovsky in the role of Shylock" with the shrug of a shoulder, the raising of an eyebrow, the drooping of a lip conveys the contempt (he) feels for the Christians who have upbraided him," according to Lewis Funke of the *N. Y. Times.* Jack Landau directed.

Landau and John Houseman, artistic director of the Festival, chose to set their production of *Much Ado* in the Spanish-American Southwest of about 100 years ago. The cast was costumed by Rouben Ter-Arutunian in embroidered Spanish attire and the stage, with a background of latticework, was transformed to a ranch house.

The program for the 1958 season will include *Hamlet with Fritz* Weaver, *MND,* and *Winter's Tale* Plans for the group to tour *Hamlet* and *M for M* at both universities and regular theatres have had to be postponed until the 1958-59 season.

$5,000 Grant Aids NYC Shakespeare Festival

A five thousand dollar grant from the Avalon foundation has been received by the New York Shakespeare Festival enabling it to continue its free Shakespeare plays for New Yorkers. The new season will open on November 25 with *Richard III* at the former Heckscher theatre, Fifth Ave. at 104th St.

Producer Joseph Papp and Director Stuart Vaughan are delving into last summer's outdoor operation to cast and produce their first production. David Amram, the composer, and Bernie Joy, the costume designer, of the summer have been retained for the winter season.

A MIDSUMMER NIGHT'S DREAM

New York Artist Illustrates Shakespeare With Sixty Paintings In Ten Years

The result of ten years of devotion to the illustration of Shakespeare was exhibited at Queens College, New York City, last Spring and later at Bucknell University.

Artist Gerth Wollheim's devotion to Shakespeare began when he was eight years old in Germany. After writing, directing, and acting, Mr. Wollheim gave up the stage to follow a greater love, painting. A life's work was left behind when he fled Nazi Germany and the labors of more years were similarly lost in the turmoil following WW II when he fled from France and came to the U. S. The artist's work, however, has been known in the U. S. having been exhibited from 1925 to 1948 in the International Exhibitions at the Carnegie Institute in Pittsburgh.

There are fifty-six portraits in the group—painted on wood panels. Four larger paintings (3' x 4') represent scenes from *Richard III, King Lear, A Midsummer Night's Dream,* and *As You Like It.*

In the brochure accompanying the Queens exhibit Ernest J. Schlochauer of the College wrote: "It takes unusual courage to accept the challenge of transferring the greatest of dramatic poetry to the medium of dramatic pictorial representation. Translating Shakespeare's words into other languages has not ever been attempted without trepidation; transmitting Shakespeare's vision and spirit to the musical score or to canvas has ever been the gravest of artistic challenges."

Mr. Wollheim told the *Newsletter* that, "My conception was to represent in my paintings what in Shakespeare's work appeals primarily to an artist: to abolish the limitations of the stage actuality in order to create typical portraits of the Shakespearean characters as I saw them."

Artist Wollheim's work has been described as highly romantic; his colors are striking; the portraits are strong, some almost caricatures. He does not claim to have found the "best solution" in all the portraits, but he hopes to enlarge "the enjoyment of reading Shakespeare."

The collection is available for free loan on application to the artist at 247 Wadsworth Avenue, N. Y. 33, N. Y.

THE SHAKESPEARE NEWSLETTER

Published at Kent, Ohio
Editor and Publisher
LOUIS MARDER
Charles Stanley Felver, Assistant Editor
David Unumb, Editorial Assistant
Department of English
KENT STATE UNIVERSITY
Kent, Ohio

Six issues annually—Feb., April, May, Sept., Nov., Dec.—Annual Subscription $1.00
Entered as Second Class Matter at the Post Office, Kent, Ohio

Vol. VII, No. 5 November, 1957

Hyphenating Shakespeare

For a long while we have been gathering a bibliography on the spelling and "meaning" of Shakespeare's name and we promise readers an article on the subject as soon as we can put it together.

The controversy over the spelling is long and historic. Proponents of "Shakspere" still exist and there are those who ponder over the hyphen in the early quartos—for example in the 1609 Sonnets—where Shake-speare is used on the title-page and as a running title on every page—and conclude for some unknown reason that it is therefor a pseudonym.

From the varieties of spelling in the quartos—Shakespeare (*LLL*, 1958); Shak-speare (*KL*, 1608); Shakespear (apocryphal *Birth of Merlin*, 1662)—to the precedent-making dropping of the final "e" in the second issue of third folio of 1664, through the 18th Century when the discovery of "documents" added spelling varieties, through the little book which in 1869 cited 4000 ways of spelling the name, [E. K. Chambers lists 83 variants, though not all referring to the poet], to Tucker-Brooke who wrote in the Tercentenary year of 1916 that the Anniversary had brought much agreement *except* to the spelling of the Bard's name, until today when the main difference is in the spelling of the derived noun or adjective—Shakespearean or Shakespearian—there has been difference of opinion. A minor problem, perhaps, but the author is a major one and deserves more uniformity. But more of this at another time.

It would be nice, however, to get some unity on the relatively simple hyphenation of the name, no matter how it is spelled. Here, at least there should be no difference of opinion.

In the *Times Literary Supplement*, in the old *Shakespeare Association Bulletin*, in Jaggard's *Bibliography*, in *Theatre Notebook*, in booksellers' catalogues, on dust jackets of Shakespearean books, in *The New York Times*, and in numerous books, we find Shakespeare hyphenated Shakes-peare. Why printers do it is a a mystery. *SNL* printers need constant restraint and frequently their slips have passed unnoticed. One would think that a name so obviously a combination of two common words would be easily divided, but the oppposite is true. Perhaps part of the prevalence is due to carelessness in proofreading. In more than one book we have noted both forms in use at the same time. In the June 30 *New York Times* both forms appeared in a single short article.

That these brief comments will do anything cataclysmic to alter a situation prevailing since the 18th Century is doubtful, but if the publishing-readers of *SNL* will correct their printers each time the faulty hyphenation occurs, it may be that in time the error will occur far less frequently than it does today.

POSTSCRIPT ON POPULARIZING

In our September issue we noted that alterations of Shakespeare were more likely to be in decor than in text, but there are of course examples of the latter also. Just after our last comments were printed we read of a *Macbeth* in modern dress staged by Joan Littlewood's Theatre Workshop at the London Stratford Theatre. In it Macbeth becomes Dictator rather than King and he does not die at the hand of Macduff but before a firing squad.

The *Newsletter* would like to print examples of such liberties with the text and invites correspondence on the subject from readers who have seen or heard of such productions.

Studies in Renaissance Drama

Samuel Schoenbaum of Northwestern University reports that at its second meeting in Washington, 1956, the Renaissance Drama Group, with Irving Ribner as acting chairman, found that its work was becoming of increasing help to its members each year. English research in progress was also reported: F. P. Wilson is revising McKerrow's *Nashe;* Clifford Leech has been appointed general editor of a new single-volume series of editions of Elizabethan and Jacobean plays after the model of the New Arden Shakespeare.

After the election of Professor Eccles (Wisconsin) as chairman and Professor Phialas (North Carolina) as secretary of the 1957 meeting, Professor Schuster spoke of the need for research in Latin drama, Professor Morphos of a similar need in French historical drama, and Professor Ribner of the need for critical editions and a volume to replace Adams' *Chief Pre-Shakespearean Dramas.* Professor Hankins suggested that a list of plays available on microfilm be established, and that commentaries on plays, without texts, might be printed.

A letter from Professor A. Jose Axelrad of the University of Lille reported work on Kyd, Ford, Marston, Heywood, and Webster and noted that he is attempting a translation into French of Marston's *Malcontent.*

Professor John Russell Brown of The Shakespeare Institute at Stratford suggested a subscription plan for single copies of off-prints as well as multiple purchases of photostats of plays to be sponsored by the group. He also reported that he is working on editions of *The White Devil* and *The Duchess of Malfi,* both plays to have full introductions, collation, and notes.

Professor Kenneth Muir of the University of Liverpool thought that it would be helpful to the study of Shakespeare's image clusters if scholars working on other plays would report the presence or absence of certain known clusters. A final suggestion was that the conference might discuss a recent work in the Renaissance or review the year's work in the field.

Among the more general projects listed as underway in the report are the following:

William A. Armstrong, King's College, London: The Elizabethan Conception of the Tyrant; The Development of Theatrical Art in England.

Sylvan Barnet, Tufts College: English Romanticism and Renaissance Drama.

Daniel C. Boughner, Brooklyn College: Ben Jonson and the Italian Renaissance.

Madeleine Doran, University of Wisconsin: The Roman Revolution as a Quarry for Renaiissance tragedy, with emphasis on the Roman plays of Shakespeare, Jonson, and Chapman.

Alan S. Downer, Princton University: Elizabethan Professional Acting.

Maurice Eastmond, Brooklyn College: "Virtue": A Study of the Renaissance Hero Concept in the Plays of Christopher Marlowe.

Wilfred T. Jewkes, University of Wisconsin: Elizabethan Stage Directions, Elizabethan Choruses.

R. J. Kaufmann, University ot Rochester: Tragic Tone from Marlowe to Dryden.

Robert J. Lordi, University of Illinois: A translated edition of *Ricardus Tertius,* a Latin school drama of 1579.

Robert J. Lordi, University of Illinois: A translated edition of *Ricardus Tertius.*

J. Max Patrick, Queens College, N. Y.: An Anthology of Treatments of Cleopatra in Literature before 1700. A Comparative Study of Treatments of the Cleopatra Theme before 1700.

Raymond H. Reno, Georgetown University: Theological Ideas in Elizabethan and Jacobean Drama.

George F. Reynolds, Boulder, Colo.: On the Elizabethan Stage: Facts, Assumptions, Inferences.

James E. Robinson, University of Illinois: The Dramatic Unities in Sixteenth Century England.

Henry F. Salerno, University of Colorado: The *Commedia dell'arte* and the Elizabethan Drama.

Eugene M. Waith, Yale University: A Study of the Importance of Admiration.

Robert M. Wren, Rutgers University: The Shakespearian Company and the Blackfirars Tradition, Doubling in the Elizabethan Drama with an Analysis of *1 Henry VI.*

Copies of the complete report may be obtained from Dr. Schoenbaum.

Shakespeare Bibliography

Anyone who can supply items for my *Shakespeare Bibliography* 1936-1956, which are not listed in any of the standard annual bibliographies that are my sources will help very much in making the bibliography more nearly complete. I shall be glad to acknowledge in print the names of all contributors.

The annual bibliographies which I am using are those of *SQ* and *SJ*, the Shakespeare sections only of *SAB, PMLA, YWES,* and *SP* (including the cross-reference numbers at the beginning of the section), the "Year's Contributions" section of SS, and the "Academies," "Sixteenth Century Literary History and Criticism," and Shakespeare sections of *MHRA.* To these are being added what items have appeared in the *L&P* bibliographies, American doctoral dissertations in *DA* and Wilson Co. publications, German dissertations in Mummendey, and other foreign dissertations from 1936-1956, inclusive.

Although all of these contain some items that the others have not included, it is still unlikely that together they exhaust all the Shakespeareana in this period. Material most likely to be elusive will be in books dealing with later eras but containing sections which compare Shakespeare with some other writers, which comment about his editors or about attitudes toward his works, or which discuss his influence upon individuals or periods. Examples of these are the section upon expurgators of Shakespeare in Quinlan's *Victorian Prelude,* the chapters on Shaw's attitudes toward Shakespeare in Henderson's *G. B. Shaw: Man of the Century,* and much of Charles Olson's *Call Me Ishmael.* Also likely to be fugitive are magazine articles dealing with similar matters, the titles of which give no indication that Shakespeare is part of their subject matter.

For obvious reasons of practicality, I cannot include items dealing only with Shakespeare's times, not with Shakespeare himself, his work, sources, influence, or associates. While it would have been more thorough to have done so, the enormous amount of Elizabethan research during the last twenty years requires a volume by itself. The criteria for inclusion, then, are these: (1) that the item should deal with Shakespeare, (2) that it should have been published in the legal sense of the term, and (3) that it should have appeared from 1936 to 1956, inclusive. Anyone who encounters such items unrecorded in any of the above-cited Shakespeare bibliographies is invited to send notice of them to me, care of the Department of English, Pennsylvania State University, University Park, Pa.

Contributions should be complete enough to permit verification. I shall acknowledge receipt of whatever is sent me.

Gordon Ross Smith, Penn. State College
State College, Pa.

LANDMARKS OF CRITICISM

Marvin Felheim at the Shakespeare Institute

How Many Children Had Lady Macbeth?

L. C. Knights

[The Minority Press, Cambridge, 1933, 70 pp.]

I

Rejecting the "irrelevant" assumption (chief offender: Bradley) that Shakespeare was "pre-eminently a great 'creator of character,'" whose poetry is merely "an added grace," Knights first sets up a definition: "A Shakespeare play is a dramatic poem. It uses action, gesture, formal grouping and symbols, and it relies upon the general conventions governing Elizabethan plays. But, we cannot too often remind ourselves, its end is to communicate a rich and controlled experience by means of words." Consequently, "the only profitable approach to Shakespeare is a consideration of his plays as dramatic poems."

He then lists those critics whose chief offense was the over-emphasis of character (particularly at the expense of the poetry): Rymer, Dryden (who failed to understand Shakespeare's use of language), Theobald, Hanmer, Pope, Johnson and Warburton. "I do not wish to deny the achievements of the Augustan age in poetry and criticism . . . but such an age was incapable of fully understanding Shakespeare's use of words." The age, however, did develop the intensive study of Shakespeare's characters, from Shaftesbury to Dryden, Theobald, Richardson and, the most famous, Morgann. These critics were satisfied with a "partial" rather than a "full" response to the plays because (1) they were unable "to appreciate the Elizabethan idiom"; (2) they were "ignorant of the stage for which Shakespeare wrote"; (3) they were hampered by "the neo-classic insistence upon the mortal function of art," by confusion about the meaning of the word "nature," and by their preoccupation with literary psychologizing and the search for "Beauties."

The nineteenth century was no better. Devoted to "the poetic," and the stressing of "personality," Shakespeare criticism, from Hazlitt to Dowden exhibited "the same kind of irrelevance."

For "the full complex response which a play of Shakespeare can evoke . . . can only be gained by treating him primarily as a poet."

II

After posing the question, "How should we read Shakespeare?" Knights proceeds to "an essay in elucidation" of *Macbeth*, in which he is primarily concerned with demonstrating the significance of passages and speeches which editors have labelled "irrelevant" or merely beautifully poetic. "*Macbeth* is a statement of evil" which has three main themes: "of the reversal of values, of unnatural disorder . . . and of the deceitful appearance, and consequent doubt, uncertainty, and confusion."

Act I, scene 1 opens with a question and has an undertone of uncertainty, yet "all is done with the greatest speed, economy and precision"; scene II is full of "images of confusion," which in scene III is "succeeded by uncertainty." In contrast, "scene IV suggests the natural order which is shortly to be violated" ("natural order" in *Macbeth* "comprehends" both "wild nature" and "humankind").

The speech of the murderers (III, I) is full of references which stand as "a symbol of the order which Macbeth wishes to restore," only "in an attempt to recreate order based on murder, disorder makes fresh inroads."

The scene in Macduff's Castle (which is *not* designed, as Bradley says, "to touch the heart") "echoes in different keys the theme of the false appearance," accompanied by Lady Macduff's teasing her son with riddles and his replies with questions.

The Malcolm-Macduff dialogue has at least three functions: their decision furthers the plot; Malcolm's suspicions "emphasize the mistrust which has spread from the central evil of the play"; and the main purpose, "choric commentary," to state the evil which Macbeth has caused.

The final effect of the tragedy is neither purgation nor exaltation. Macbeth himself is *not* "sentimentalized," but is completely identified with evil; "the positive good is presented by means of religious symbols" (as in the dialogue between Lennox and another Lord, III, vi); also, "images of health and disease are clearly related to moral good and evil."

Knights points up the "reversal" in the last act: whereas Macbeth has formerly been the agent of the unnatural, now it is Malcolm (who orders the "moving" of Birnam Wood) and Macduff (his unnatural birth); in so doing, Shakespeare "emphasizes the disorder and at the same time frees our minds from the burden of the horror. After all, the movement of Birnam Wood and Macduff's unnatural birth have a simple enough explanation."

The poetry of Macbeth's final speech ("Life's but a walking shadow . . .") almost "bullies" us into accepting "an essential ambiguity": that his "ruin is never complete . . ., that he never totally loses our sympathy." *But*, we must remember the speech is "placed" by the "tendency" of the last act: order emerging from disorder, truth emerging from behind deceit, the death of Macbeth and the final words of Siward, Macduff and Malcolm.

[N. B. The title "slightly parodies" those "pseudo-critical investigations" against which the essay is directed.]

STATEMENT REQUIRED BY THE ACT OF AUGUST 24, 1912, AS AMENDED BY THE ACTS OF MARCH 3, 1933, AND JULY 2, 1946 (Title 39, United States Code, Section 233) SHOWING THE OWNERSHIP, MANAGEMENT, AND CIRCULATION OF

THE SHAKESPEARE NEWSLETTER published 6 times per year, Feb., Apr., May, Sept., Nov., Dec. at Kent, Ohio for November, 1957.

1. The names and addresses of the publisher, editor, managing editor, and business managers are:

Publisher—Louis Marder, Kent State University, Kent, Ohio.
Editor—Same
Managing Editor—Same
Business Manager—Same

2. The owner is: (If owned by a corporation, its name and address must be stated and also immediately thereunder the names and addresses of stockholders owning or holding 1 percent or more of total amount of stock. If not owned by a corporation, the names and addresses of the individual owners must be given. If owned by a partnership or other unincorporated firm, its name and address, as well as that of each individual member, must be given.)

Louis Marder, Kent State University, Kent, O.

3. The known bondholders, mortgagees, and other security holders owning or holding 1 percent or more of total amount of bonds, mortgages, or other securities are: (If there are none, so state.)

None.

4. Paragraphs 2 and 3 include, in cases where the stockholder or security holder appears upon the books of the company as trustees or in any other fiduciary relation, the name of the person or corporation for whom such trustee is acting; also the statements in the two paragraphs show the affiant's full knowledge and belief as to the circumstances and conditions under which stockholders and security holders who do not appear upon the books of the company as trustees, hold stock and securities in a capacity other than that of a bona fide owner.

5. The average number of copies of each issue of this publication sold or distributed, through the mails or otherwise, to paid subscribers during the 12 months preceding the date shown above was: (This information is required from daily, weekly, semiweekly, and triweekly newspapers only.)

LOUIS MARDER, Owner

Sworn to and subscribed before me this 24th day of October, 1957.

MARGARET A. SCHMIEDL, Notary Public
(My commission expires Aug. 17, 1959.)

Shakespeare

FROM RICHARD II TO HENRY V

Derek Traversi

One of the most stimulating of modern Shakespearean critics offers his superb interpretations of *Richard II*, *Henry IV Part I*, *Henry IV Part II*, and *Henry V*. Through close analysis of the dramatic elements, the book brilliantly establishes the unity of conception which prevails in the series of plays.

$4.25

Shakespeare

THE LAST PHASE

Derek Traversi

"An interesting and absorbing study of *Pericles, The Winter's Tale, Cymbeline,* and *The Tempest* . . . A valuable contribution to Shakespearean criticism."—*Theatre Arts.*

"The four studies are thorough, perceptive, and exhibit great scholarship, coupled with clarity and great beauty."—*Wilson Library Bulletin.*

$4.75

Elizabethans at Home

Lu Emily Pearson

The everyday life of the Elizabethans—homes, gardens, food, clothing, courtship, marriage, the rearing of children—re-created to present a complete and detailed picture of the Elizabethan home. 22 pages of photographs, drawings.

$8.75

The Complete Works of Montaigne

ESSAYS, TRAVEL JOURNAL, LETTERS

Newly Translated by

Donald M. Frame

1120 pages, $12.50

Stanford University Press

Stanford, California

Current Bibliography:

Shakespeare Quarterly, VIII:2 (Spring 1957), 141-305, (Index for 1956 bound in at end, pp. xiii), Ed. by James G. McManaway, for The Shakespeare Association of America. (New subscription rate is $8.50 per yr.)

This is an issue of unusual size including the usual quota of articles, reviews, short notices, etc., along with the "Annotated Bibliography for 1956" edited by Paul A. Jorgensen with the aid of foreign correspondents. We wonder how many besides us would like to see the Bibliography arranged by subject rather than by author. We imagine that those who resort to the Bibliography are seeking for *what* has been done rather than to see *who* has done it. Classification would be a chore, but well worth the effort. Brief abstracts of the major articles follow.

"Cordelia and Lear," Ivor Morris, Gothenburg University, SQ, VIII, 141-158.

Cordelia's answer to Lear's question, "What can you say to draw/ A third more opulent than your sisters?" is not, as Bradley and later critics suppose a spontaneous and unfortunate outburst of injured feeling; rather "she is reproducing Lear's error—and doing this deliberately" so as to shock the king into seeing himself as she sees him. Such ironic mimicry used as an instrument of moral persuasion is a common device in Shakespeare. Here it combines powerfully with Renaissance ideas of kingship (especially as set forth in Lipsius) to make of Cordelia's response a bold and desperate strategy to save her father from her sisters.

"Richard II, Martyr," Karl F. Thompson, Michigan State University, SQ, VIII, 159-166.

Richard is a martyr in the popular Elizabethan sense, not in the severely orthodox sense of traditional Christian martyrology. That is, he does not yield the ghost without heroic struggle, and his death provokes quick retribution against his enemies. Orthodox martyrdom is undramatic and the orthodox martyr unpersuasive but Richard can be simultaneously a "martyr" and the protagonist of an eminently satisfying drama. "The mind of the audience for which Shakespeare wrote demanded a hero who fought: most of us incline . . . to sympathy for the kind of martyrdom that follows a stout resistance and is followed in turn by instant retribution."

"The Human Shakespeare and Troilus and Cressida," William R. Bowden, Dickinson College, SQ, VIII, 167-177.

The popular notion (advanced by L. B. Campbell and others) that Shakespeare condemns conduct that is swayed by passion rather than by reason is too narrow and doctrinaire. Specifically, "Interpretations which . . . condemn the conduct of Troilus and Hector on the ground that it is irrational are far afield from Shakespeare's intention." Shakespeare judges by "an essentially intuitive moral standard which can be applied to acts of reason and non-reason alike . . . Shakespeare does not subscribe to the doctrine that reason is the supreme good."

"Mind and Hand," John Lawlor, University College of North Staffordshire, SQ, VIII, 179-193.

A study of Shakespeare's imagery ought to be of the first importance to producer and actor as well as to the critic, because "producer, actor, and spectator alike have their only warrant in the text." This is so, despite H. S. Bennett's objection that "the total result when we read the text and can group images and stop to compare one passage with another is a different result from that obtained in the theatre." Lawlor concludes that "The study of Shakespeare's dramatic imagery, the image in the mouth of the player, may be of most benefit to us in challenging our habitual responses to Sh.'s text."

"The Character of Hamlet's Mother," Carolyn Heilbron, New School, N. Y., SQ, VIII, 201-206.

Bradley, Granville Barker, and Dover Wilson (inter alia) find Gertrude a "weak-minded vacillating woman." But much in the play (e.g., II.ii.56-57; III.i.38-42; III.ii.240; V.i.266-269) opposes this view. Gertrude is the slave of passion, but she is also "intelligent, penetrating, and gifted with a remarkable talent for concise and pithy speech," in which last respect she is akin to Horatio.

"Timon of Athens," R. P. Draper, University of Adelaide, SQ, VIII, 195-200.

Timon of Athens is a transitional play, in which Shakespeare is feeling his way towards a treatment of the subjects of evil and destruction and of the clash of the ideal and the real which is rather different from that in the tragedies "What Sh. seems to have gained from the experience of writing this play is a realization of the organic quality of change in man and society"—it is a prelude to the themes of healing and regeneration in the last comedies.

"Shakespeare in the Nineteenth-Century Songsters," Ray B. Browne, University of Maryland, SQ, VIII, 207-218.

Browne finds forty popular songs of Nineteenth-Century England which repeat, paraphrase, allude to or burlesque Shakespeare's poems and plays. Despite the bardolatry of this period Shakespeare was for the songsters a "popular" playwright who could be accorded familiar or even irreverent treatment.

Biography in Brief:

JAMES ORCHARD HALLIWELL-PHILLIPPS

Philip Highfill, Jr., George Washington University

When James O. Halliwell (1820-1889) arrived at Cambridge at seventeen he had already contributed a series of biographies to *The Parthenon* and begun the first of his several great manuscript collections. In 1839, at nineteen, he was elected to the Royal Society and published, with no sense of irony, *A Few Hints to Novices in Manuscript Literature*. At twenty he was one of the members of the council of the first Shakespeare Society, along with Payne Collier, Dyce, Talfourd, Douglas Jerrold, W. C. Macready, and Charles Dickens. He was also well embarked on the course of scholarly activity which produced near 300 books, and articles uncountable. Halliwell was a six-footer whose iron-gray beard increased a resemblance to R. E. Lee in which he took pleasure. His life was full of alarums as well as of work. He married his first wife in the teeth of threats by her father, the wealthy antiquary Sir Thomas Phillipps. So the couple struggled for years, Halliwell building up fabulous collections, then selling them at auction. At the onset of the long mental illness which led to her death, he took his wife's name, better to manage property which finally descended to her. He urbanely shrugged aside attacks by F. J. Furnivall, but was drawn into bitter controversy with the Stratford corporation. An early charge that he had abstracted items from the Trinity College library which were later sold to the British Museum caused his exclusion from the Museum for a long period, but he published an explanation satisfactory to many of his contemporaries. After his second marriage Halliwell acquired Hollingbury Copse, on the Sussex downs, there building his "quaint wigwam," a connected congeries of sheet-iron and shingle shanties, given an Elizabethan look by half-timbering and many chimney pots. Here he built up his last collection of manuscripts, early plays, drawings, engravings, maps, and other materials pertaining to Shakespeare. There was time in the rigorous schedule for hospitality. He was particularly fond of taking Americans down "Dogberry Lane" to the entrance, and thence along "Wolsey's Walk" to the study where awaited high tea and a fortune in Tudor rarities.

His Shakespearean Work

The extension of exhaustiveness in documentation to the study of Shakespeare's life and times was Halliwell's chief scholarly contribution. Though a contemporary charged that "No man was [his] equal for cutting up bound books, throwing away the books and saving a scrap, to be mounted and written to, until mor-sels became portly . . . folios," some modern authorities believe that the scrapbooks are not the result of such vandalism, but are merely built around clippings from books which came to him already fragmentary or mutilated.

In 1848 he put Stratford records to use for the first time in his short *Life of William Shakespeare*. In 1850 came the *New Boke about Shakespeare and Stratford-on-Avon*. From 1853 to 1865 his sixteen-volume folio edition, magnificently illustrated and crammed with criticism, came out. In 1862 he arranged and catalogued, without fee, nearly 6,000 documents at Stratford and began the 48-volume lithographed facsimile series of Quartos. He was also instrumental in raising 5,000 pounds to purchase the site of New Place, and began, at his own expense, to make available the Stratford documents by private publication. In 1874 he published *Illustrations of the Life of William Shakespeare*. Its aim was "a critical investigation into . . . every recorded incident in the personal and literary history of Shakespeare." From 1881 through 1887 he issued, in successively larger editions, *Outlines of the Life of Shakespeare*, which embodied the cream of his collections and, finally, the results of his ransacking of muniment rooms in seventy-odd remote places. The fruit of the "great fancy for record research," which he says led him to devote forty years to "the evidential study of the poet's biography," is to be seen also in several great collections today. The Folger Library now owns many of his manuscripts, about 2,000 of his printed books, about 125 of his large folio scrap-books, and nearly forty boxes of detached clippings and transcripts.

We Have Done More For Less

Showgirl Barbara Hall answered these questions for $64,000 on June 25. Identify the following characters and words: 1) The dam of Caliban. 2) Queen of the Amazons. 3) All the perfume of_____. 4) Wife of Hotspur. 5) Name of the Earl of March. 6) Moneylender. 7) "'tis the curse of service, _____ goes by letter and affection and not by old gradation." 8) Mother of King John. 9) Executioner in *Measure for Measure*. 10)_____by any other name. 11) Touchstone said these are not to be mixed with the rams. [We are not sure of the quotation in 7 but the word is appropriate. The answers constitute a vertical acrostic of a well known person.]

Minnesota Players Tour Shakespeare in Europe and Orient

Dr. Frank M. Whiting, head of the University of Minnesota theatre, announced that their traditional Shakespearean production will tour the North Central States and the Orient with the U.S. Defense Department for ten weeks following their campus appearance on Nov. 28-30 and Dec. 3-8. The play this year is *The Taming of the Shrew*.

Last year's production, *MND*, traveled through France and Germany in July under Defense Department auspices, playing at army and air force bases. The 14 member group gave 21 performances during the three week tour.

Whiting, director and a member of the group, said the trip was a "test case to see if Shakespeare could hold a GI audience." The answer was definitely in the affirmative. The enthusiasm of some of the audiences exceeded that of anything on the Minneapolis campus during the regular run of the play.

8TH INTERNATIONAL SHAKESPEARE CONFERENCE AT STRATFORD

Approximately fifty scholars from the British Isles, the U. S., France, Italy, Switzerland, Poland, and the U.S.S.R. attended the 8th Bi-annual International Shakespeare Conference held at The Shakespeare Institute, Stratford-upon-Avon, from September 1 to 6.

The theme of the Conference was "The Elizabethan Theatre, Past and Present." Nine papers and an actors' forum were presented under the sponsorship of the University of Birmingham, the University of Manchester, The Shakespeare Memorial Theatre, and the British Council. Professor Allardyce Nicoll, Director of the Institute was chairman of the Conference.

Producing Elizabethan plays for a Modern Audience

Mr. Nugent Monck, Maddermarket Theatre, Norwich

Drawing upon his experiences as Director of the Maddermarket Theatre, Mr. Monck spoke of the practical difficulties facing the producer who presented Shakespeare on the modern stage He described the movement started by William Poel and carried on by Granville-Barker, in which attention was paid to the correct speaking of the verse and the best theatrical conditions for the plays.

He had decided early in his career that it was essential to practice these principles in one place and with one permanent company. His move to Norwich in 1910 provided an ideal opportunity, for the plays of Shakespeare were then only infrequently performed in the provinces. In Norwich he laid the foundations of the organization which has since grown into the Norwich Players. He described with a wealth of anecdote the gradual and often painful growth of the company, until they acquired the now famous Maddermarket Theatre in 1921. The building had been successively a Roman Catholic chapel, a baking powder factory, and a Salvation Army barracks, and he felt that his theatre was carrying on this "elevating tendency."

He described the construction of the theatre, and spoke of the special effects which could be achieved by the use of the stage he had built. As in Shakespeare"s Globe there was an inner stage and a gallery. He instanced the use made of this gallery in his productions of Shakespeare's plays, explaining its use for the whole of the Induction to *The Taming of the Shrew* and how it represented the box hedge in Act II, Scene V of *Twelfth Night.*

A particular and striking effect could be obtained by using the gallery for the shipboard scene which opens *The Tempest* so that the stage level was immediately localised as Prospero's island. Mr. Monck went on to speak of the curtains on his stage and the way in which they could be made an integral part of the style of production. He rejected any mechanical means of opening and closing curtains, and suggested that Shakespeare's purposes would be best served if the actors themselves manipulated the curtains as a means of discovering or shutting off the various acting areas, and of creating a smooth continuity between scene and scene. Curtains, used thus, were a form of dramatic punctuation.

Discussion: Prof. Benvenuto Cellini, Chairman

Mr. Monck was questioned both as to the dimensions of the stage he had built, and the principles which guided him in cutting plays for performance before a modern audience. On this latter point he gave to Professor Stamm an answer he had previously given Lady Gregory, that what bored him would bore his audience and he cut such passages in production.

In reply to Professor Cellini's comment that the Elizabethan stage might be considered a compromise between the morality and the pageant traditions, Mr. Monck remarked that as far as he could see Burbage had simply built an inn-yard without an inn.

The Elizabethan Stage and the Lantern of Taste

Mr. C. Walter Hodges

In introducing the speaker the chairman, Professor Wilson, paid a tribute to the pioneering work of Sir Edmund Chambers in amassing such a wealth of historical material on the structure of the Elizabethan theatre. He explained that Mr. Hodges' approach depended not only on factual evidence but upon his own creative instincts as an artist.

Mr. Hodges began by showing how the "lantern of taste" in different ages had thrown light more on the attitudes of those ages than on the essential facts of Elizabethan theatre construction. Just as the "improvements" of Dryden, the expurgations of Bowdler and the eccentricities of modern Old Vic productions all interpreted the text of Shakespeare to suit the perceptions of different generations, so the ideas of the physical form of the Elizabethan theatre have corresponded to changes in the contemporary fashion. He thought that there could be no final solution to this problem, and his personal "baroque" impression differed strongly from such conceptions as that of J. C. Adams. As an artist, however, he was more concerned with the recreation of a possible and workable Elizabethan theatre than with the reconstruction of any one specific playhouse.

He illustrated his talk with coloured slides showing firstly the line of development in theatre construction from the mountebank stage and the Inn yard to the Swan playhouse, and secondly the logical and creative progress of his own ideas on the problem of recreating an Elizabethan theatre. The starting-point for all his illustrations was De Witt's drawing of the Swan, and though they exhibited an increasing complexity of design and ornamentation, he was able to show that beneath his last and most detailed impression lay the simple structure sketched by De Witt.

Verse and Character; the Elizabethan Solution and the Modern Actor.

Dr. Bertram L. Joseph, University of Bristol

In introducing the speaker the chairman, Sir Barry Jackson, deplored the lack of music in the delivery of so many modern actors and actresses. It was a central point of Dr. Joseph's talk that the modern actor had both to personate character and appreciate poetry: an audience must be at least as aware of poetry on the stage as on the printed page. He suggested that in an ideal performance both characterisation and poetic appreciation should have equal value. We gained a stronger sense of character, and less poetry than we should, from many modern performances. We ought to get more poetry from actors, but not at the expense of character.

The actor's task was to desire emotionally what his intellect told him the character itself desired: his technique must be to embody the passion of the poetry in his own person. Dr. Joseph indicated a method of study which would lead to a solution. His remarks were based upon practical experiments with actors at the Mermaid and the Bristol Old Vic theatres. In his preparation the actor must constantly be aware that Shakespeare's verse was not an impediment to the realisation of character, but Shakespeare's manner of conceiving that character. Elizabethan acting was not formal and rhetorical in the sense that "formal" is opposed to "natural" but it must suit the formality of the words. Thus, it was the problem of the modern actor first to understand and experience the patterns and figures of Shakespeare's writing, and then to suit the meanings of such patterns with their proper and appropriate form.

Dr. Joseph illustrated his lecture by tape-recordings of selected passages from Shakespeare, and by demonstrations given by Mr. Duncan Ross.

ADDITIONAL PAPERS IN DECEMBER

Some Considerations on Reconstructing an Elizabethan Playhouse

Dr. Richard Southern, International Theatre Institute

In returning to the theme of the previous day's discussions Dr. Southern began by pointing out that in theoretical discussion of the problems one could admit uncertainty, but that in the task of physical reconstruction such problems had not only to be recognized but solved. He based his own interpretation on two pieces of undisputed contemporary evidence offered in Elizabethan documents, the builders' contracts for the Fortune Theatre, and on two famous engravings, the De Witt drawing of the Swan and Hollar's view of London.

The first question presented to the conjectural reconstructor was whether the theatre should be circular or polygonal. There was no simple solution even to this, since at least one theatre was square. Illustrating his comments on the structure of the auditorium with both contemporary reproductions and his own plans and sketches, Dr. Southern dealt first with the nature of the structure of the three galleries. Both the De Witt drawing and the builders' contracts show that there must have been rows of seats in each gallery. His experience in constructing a model from the building specifications had convinced him that five rows of seats could be placed in the first gallery, four rows in the second gallery and only two in the top gallery, if the sightline requirements were to be met.

He demonstrated the necessity for a passageway on the second level encircling the theatre behind the rows of seats allowing access to the various boxes. This would explain the presence in the Hollar engraving of the row of windows needed to light this corridor. The sight-lines again determined the possible positions of the partitions dividing the galleries into boxes. The towers shown in Hollar were also appropriately sited to provide access for spectators to the upper gallery.

At this point Dr. Southern disputed the view of some critics that the Elizabethan playhouse was ill-designed for both visibility and comfort, showing that in fact Elizabethan designers were particular in matters often neglected by our modern theatre builders. After more briefly considering the problems of the stage and tiring-house he concluded by asking two questions of his audience, concerning the manner of door-hinging shown in De Witt which suggested that the doors opened on to the stage, and whether in fact the floor of the stage was strewn with rushes which would create difficulty of movement for both actors and properties.

Discussion: Prof. Terrence Spencer, Chairman

After the chairman had invited members to inspect the illustrative material in greater detail, a discussion took place. Professor Richard Hosley asked what position seemed suggested for the "Hut" and the "Heavens," and their apparent relevance in the structure. Dr. Southern thought the "Heavens" may have been arranged to prevent shadow on the stage itself. The "Hut" would act as a machine room for hoists and a crane. The sloping roof below would be the loading room for actors to install themselves in such machines. Professor Hosley asked if the sloping roof might be an acoustic aid but Dr. Southern thought such a building would be acoustically satisfactory in its own right. Mr. C. Walter Hodges supported the view of the "Heavens" as a screen from the afternoon light.

Professor A. C. Sprague commented on the use made of a rush-strewn stage in Mr. Watkins's reconstruction of an Elizabethan theatre at Harrow, and Dr. Southern suggested that the difficulties of a rush-strewn stage applied less to the movements of the actors than to the manipulation of stage furniture and the working of the traps. Professor Chwalevik questioned the relative space allotted to the groundlings, and Dr. Southern agreed that there was difficulty in reconciling the space allowed by the specifications with the number of people indicated in contemporary reports as present in an Elizabethan theatre.

CURRENT BIBLIOGRAPHY

Irwin Smith, Shakespeare's Globe Playhouse, New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1956, pp. xxiv-240, $7.00.

Dr. James G. McManaway points out in his introduction that Irwin Smith's book is designed to provide "specific information about the structure of the Globe," as well as "scale drawings that could be adapted to the requirements of a model builder." Mr. Smith himself believes that his book is "the most ambitious attempt yet made to state in graphic form the findings of modern scholarship with respect to Shakespeare's playhouse."

"In the great majority of instances," Mr. Smith declares , his statements are "based upon the work of Dr. Adams," and the scale model drawings and pictures are based upon the model made by John Cranford Adams with the assistance of Mr. Smith. The book is lavishly illustrated: there are 16 plates showing contemporary views of the site of the Globe and the theatre itself; 9 plates showing costumes, theatrical interiors and devices; 6 plates showing various views of the Adams model; and twelve illustrative figures.

Everything that one would hope to find commented upon in a volume of such scope seems to be discussed clearly and objectively by Mr. Smith. The 14 chapters include a history of the theatre, discussions of its site, shape, dimensions, and fabric, descriptions of the auditorium, platform, tiring house exterior, inner stages, rear stage, second-level stages, music gallery, and superstructure; Chapter 13 gives detailed instructions for producing *Romeo and Juliet* or *Henry IV* at Smith and Adams' Globe; and Chapter 14 presents and discusses the scale drawings. The two appendices reproduce the Fortune Builder's contract and the Hope Builder's contract, and the bibliography seems to be complete. All in all this is a book which will probably have the last word on an important subject for some time to come.

Paul N. Siegel, Shakespearean Tragedy and the Elizabethan Compromise, New York, New York University Press, 1957, pp. xvi-243, $5.00.

Paul N. Siegel of Long Island University develops his study from the thesis that the "Elizabethan social order was based on a social, political, and religious compromise dependent on the fact that the old pre-Tudor aristocracy, the new Tudor aristocracy, and the bourgeoisie balanced one another in strength and that the continuation of this compromise was rendered impossible when the bourgeoisie grew in power after the defeat of the . . . Armada."

Out of the destruction of this compromise grew "questionings of the Christian humanist world view"; a view expressed in Shakespearean tragedy along with the "philosophical and emotional reverberations caused by the breaking up of its material basis." After developing the background of his thesis in 5 chapters, Dr. Siegel focuses on Shakespeare in chapter 6, and discusses *Hamlet, Othello, Macbeth,* and *King Lear* in chapters 7-12. He finds Denmark to be "a reflection of warlike middle-class opinion" about Cecil's foreign policy; Venice "the image of a free and independent state fighting for its freedom" like England; *Macbeth* reflects the "clash between the Christian humanist and the 'Machiavellian' views as to what is proper to man"; and "the world of *King Lear* [is] both primitive and a mirror of degenerate contemporary society." There are careful notes in a separate section, and an index.

GENTLE READER: At long last the addressograph plates have been completed. Corrections are being made. Won't you please check your date and make your subscription current if you are in arrears? Many thanks.

Lu Emily Pearson, Elizabethans at Home, Stanford, Stanford University Press, 1957, pp. 630, $8.75.

Dr. Pearson, Professor of English at San Jose State College, with the help of 29 illustrations varying from "A voluntary's banquet, to a "Bread safe suspended from ceiling," brings her reader a detailed picture of the life of poor and wealthy people in the days of Elizabeth. "We shall rise with them in the morning, sometimes stand among those who assisted at the intricacies of putting together various parts of their daily attire, follow them through the multitudinous duties of the home, sit with them at the table, and join them at evening for family prayers."

A 13-page biblography attests to the care Dr. Pearson has taken in basing her generalizations about the various aspects of Elizabethan life on meticulously detailed investigation of various primary sources. But the book is of interest to every reader who cares at all to learn about the lively, closely-knit home life of the Elizabethans, and to discover that in these father-directed homes "personal happiness depended on collective happiness, and that both were born and bred and flowered in the home: that the home made living purposive."

John Garrett, editor. Talking of Shakespeare. London. Hodder and Stoughton, Ltd., 1954, pp. 264, $2.80.

John Garrett, Headmaster of Bristol Grammar School, has brought together a selection of the lectures presented for 7 years prior to 1954 at the Shakespeare Memorial Theatre, Stratford-upon-Avon. The selections, therefore, are directed primarily to the intelligent layman rather than the scholar.

Mr. Garrett regards his job in this collection as "no less than to share with our pupils the revelation of life given by the man who knew more about the workings of the heart and mind than anyone who has written about humanity." To help in this sharing process he includes discussions by Neville Coghill on "Shakespeare as a Dramatist," Paul Dehn on "The Filming of Shakespeare," Patric Dickinson on "Shakespeare as a Poet," as well as investigations of other aspects of Shakespeare's art and age by Norman Marshall, Walter Oakeshott, Michael Redgrave, A. P. Rossiter, A. L. Rowse, L. A. G. Strong, Glynne Wickham, and J. Dover Wilson.

The discussions are lively,provocative, like all such collections more lecture than literary essays and wanting somewhat in the helpful inflections and gestures that originally punctuated them, but withal stimulating. An index is provided.

G. R. Elliott, Flaming Minister a Study of Othello, Durham, N. C., Duke University Press, 1953, pp. xxxvi-245, $4.50.

Dr. Elliott, Folger professor emeritus of Amherst College, believes that *Othello* and its companion play *Hamlet* do "not really belong in 'Shakespearean tragedy'" because "the characters of Othello and Hamlet . . . were considerably divorced from that common humanity which Shakespeare designed them to have, like all his other leading personages."

In developing his thesis Dr. Elliott tries "to visualize the action of the play on the stage," and to demonstrate that "Othello was designed to overtop Iago." He divides his study into an introductory essay on "Pride, Renaissance Tragedy, and the Design of *Othello*," and three succeeding "Phases": "Othello's Visage," "Patience . . . Grim as Hell," and "Wedding." An Index is provided.

Clifford Leech, John Ford and the Drama of His Time, Fair Lawn, NJ, Essential Books, Inc., 1957, pp. 144, $2.30.

It is the intention of Professor Leech "to throw light on Ford's genius by tracing in his work the emergence of types of dramatic writing highly characteristic of their author, and to bring out their distinguishing marks by presenting them in relation to . . . the drama of the Jacobean and Caroline years." He believes that Ford learned much from Shakespeare, "but only in one play, *Tis Pity She's a Whore*, . . . did he attempt to reproduce the tragic manner of the opening years of the century."

Whereas in Shakespeare's tragedy "there is something of protest, something of regret," Ford's characters "are confident of their values," and "they can go to their deaths with an aristocratic lack of dread." Ford is not a writer of the first rank, his works cannot be appreciated as can *King Lear*, for example, on any level of consciousness." But when he is at his best in his tragicomedies, "he dignifies not only human passion but the human condition."

Shakespearean Manual of Quotations, Characters, Scenes and Plays, Baltimore, Ottenheimer Publishers, 1955, The Vest-Pocket Library, pp. 224, $1.00.

Here is the handy compendium for the after-dinner speaker in search of easy erudition, that modern swami, the quiz show contestant, or the just plain curious. The print is small, but the format is easy to follow, and the size convenient for those who still own vests.

Fall Catalogue Now Mailing

No. 168 1957

A Catalogue Of

ELIZABETHAN ITEMS

With

A

Non-Elizabethan

Miscellany

As An

Addendum

THE ELIZABETHAN BOOKSELLER

508 Madison Street

WAUKEGAN, ILLINOIS

SEND CARD FOR COPY

CRITICS AND VISUAL AIDS

W. M. Merchant of University College, Cardiff, declares that to interpret Shapespeare properly critics must consider visual elements which have shaped stage-tradition: theatrical decor, book illustration, famous paintings. Theatrical decor shapes interpretation because it is handed down from age to age; illustrations in printed editions, and major artists' paintings of the plays have influenced scene designers. And critics are more influenced by what they see on the stage than by closet study. From baroque settings, through the architectural, pastoral, and historical settings of the 18th-19th centuries, to modern stagings which employ lighting and merely evocative backgrounds, visual arts have influenced both the interpretation and the movement of Shakespeare's plays. A modern producer may attempt to reconstruct a "Globe" performance, or to treat Shakespeare as a "modern" like Fry, or to "translate" Shakespeare's stage into 20th-century terms, but he cannot ignore the visual history of the stage, for it is "a tradition embedded in our critical thinking and . . . still shapes our assumptions about character, movement and setting." ["Visual Elements in Shakespeare Studies," *Shakespeare Jahrbuch*, XCII (1956), 280-290.]

WHICH CAME FIRST?

Robert A. Law disputes E. A. J. Honigman's contention (Arden Shakespeare, *King John*, 1954) "that Shakespeare's play preceded *The Troublesome Reigne*, and that 'the two plays were written within a few months of each other at most in 1590-91.'" Historical, stylistic and structural considerations all support the generally accepted dating of 1594-96. For example 1) the Queen's Players in 1591 would scarcely venture "to duplicate in its characters, its setting, and practically its entire action a play that had just been given by a competing company"; 2) "dramatically effective incident" and "sound grasp of character," the idea of divine right, etc. clearly connect *King John* with *Richard II* rather than with the very early plays; 3) the general nature of both the characters and the poetic expression is "utterly different" in the two plays, so that the one could not be a "bad quarto" of the other. "In the field of Shakespeare's chronology, the patient labor of generations of scholars since Malone began it has erected a large body of truth . . . Without compelling reason we should not be ready [as Honigmann is] to upturn the very foundations on which the whole structure is built." ["On the Date of King John," *Studies in Philology*, LIV:2 (April 1957), 119-27.] [cf. review of the Arden ed. by Irving Ribner, *SNL*, V:1:14.]

THE TEXT FOR FOLIO R III

Andrew S. Cairncross argues that the Folio text of *Richard III* "was printed from *three* of the six quartos then available—Q1, Q3, and Q6—used in some sort of rotation, and corrected with varying degrees of accuracy from an authentic manuscript," ruling out the current view that Q6 (or Q3) was used as a prompt-book, or that a copy of Q6 had been collated with the manuscript. The copy for *Richard III* "seems to have consisted mainly of Q1 and Q3, supplemented by Q6." Copies of these Jaggard ("as likely as another") collated to a varying degree with a manuscript that Heminge and Condell had sent, the extent of their hand in F. The printing-house staff alone is responsible for general F corruption. The textual basis of Q1 is now "open to suspicion" because QF agreements, no longer "a guarantee derived from two independent versions," may hide F failures to correct Q errors. Although "freedom of emendation is correspondingly enlarged . . . . so is editorial responsibility." ["The Quartos and the Folio Text of *Richard III*," *RES*, VIII:31 (August 1957), 225-33.]

If . . .
"I never gave you kingdom, call'd you children,
You owe me no subscription . . ."
But for SNL . . .
"Embrace the occasion" and check date on name plate.

REVIEW OF PERIODICALS

THE TRAGIC INTERLUDE

Sylvan Barnet, concluding, in "Bernard Shaw on Tragedy," that "Shaw's strictures on tragedy are severe," resolves the paradox of Shaw's attitude which made him seem to quarrel with Shakespeare for writing tragedies while at the same time Shaw was writing tragedies himself. Mr. Barnet's explanation involves Shaw's philosophy—that of a romantic and a comic dramatist for whom "evil has no real existence" and for whom a belief in Creative Evolution is forever at war with the "pessimism" embodied in the ethical concepts behind Shakespeare's tragedies. Shaw's "difficulty in liking Shakespeare is related to his indifference to tragic form." For in Shaw's view existence is a "continual state of becoming," and therefore his plays lack "the finality against which the tragic hero struggles, reveals his capabilities, and is spent." Because "Shaw refuses to admit that the movement of life . . . is from birth to death," and "insists on going beyond what is the apparent end," plays like *The Doctor's Dilemma*, *Heartbreak House*, and *Saint Joan*, "all called tragedies," are really just as Shaw described them: "interludes, as it were, between two greater realities. . . . what has preceded them and . . . what follows them." [Bernard Shaw on Tragedy," *PMLA*, LXXI:5 (December 1956), 888-899.]

SYMBOLS IN ANTONY & CLEOPATRA

Antony's fate grows out of the tragic conflict between the values of Egypt and Rome; the use of these geographical symbols throughout the play are supported by others writes Maurice Charney of Rutgers University. Antony's sword and armor represent his Roman side. His sword in Egypt becomes ineffectual—Caesar won't fight him, and even his attempted suicide fails. The sword is stolen and carried to Caesar, symbolizing the ruin of Roman Antony. "Sword" assumes sexual, Egyptian connotations too; Cleopatra saps his manhood and thus renders his sword at Actium weak "by affection." His disarming before suicide is highly symbolic—he is "No more a soldier." His downward movement is also indicated by a theme of vertical dimension; he *sits down* after Actium, indicating his fall—but is lifted aloft to indicate his elevation in death. Antony's downward course after Actium is also illustrated by imagery of dissolution: melting, fading, dissolving, discandying, disponging, dislimning, losing of form. Cleopatra marks his death: "The crown o' th' earth doth melt." "Rather than being resolved, the conflict between Egypt and Rome ceases to exist, and the hard 'visible shapes' of Rome are dissolved into an ecstatic, poetic reality." [Shakespeare's Antony: A Study of Image Themes," *SP*, LIV:2 (April '57), 149-61.]

THE GERMANS AND THE WITCHES

The Witches' scenes in *Macbeth* raised problems for 18th century German translators who had to deal with questions of metrical form, content, and dramatic relationship, writes Edna Purdie. Wieland, concerned mainly with meaning, struggled with metrics in the early witch scenes, and then gave up the effort, rendering the cauldron scene in a prose summary. Eschenbury sought accuracy in rendering, but Burger tried to reproduce the incantatory effects, His aim was atmosphere, tone, cadence; he was willing to sacrifice literal meaning to achieve it. While he sometimes added material not in his original, his translation shows inventive skill and fidelity to dramatic effect. Schiller attempted to eliminate "superstition," to make the witches acceptable to prevailing taste: he "rationalized" them by stressing the abstract notions they symbolized. His version, alone, is verse throughout. Only in 19th century translations are the blank verse, prose, and lyric passages of the original preserved. "It is here that a more rigorous fidelity to form, in the fullest sense, begins." [Observations on Some Eighteenth Century Versions of the Witches' Scenes in Macbeth," *Shakespeare Jahrbuch*, XCII (1956), 96-109.]

THE RISE OF SECULAR DRAMA

Drama revived not in the Renaissance but the Middle Ages, where an acting tradition was developed, character types established, the devil popularized, and later tragic villains anticipated in personifications of the vices. Renaissance developments were increased secularization and the influence of classical drama, the former being "tremendously accelerated" by the latter. Classical comedy influenced dramatic form and technique and led to the use of "contemporary realistic materials," and comment on the times. Classical tragedy "had exactly the opposite effect." The popularity of dramatized romances, ballads, and national histories strengthened opposition to "the more formal aspects of classicism."

Mature Renaissance drama is "expansive" and "romantic"; sexual love is central. Romantic comedy "asserts the positive values of life," and seeks in marriage the "perpetuation of these qualities into the future through the begetting of children." *As You Like It* and *Twelfth Night* illustrate the "great achievement of Renaissance romantic comedy; to have created an ideal of womanhood so attractive and charming" that it lives still.

Renaissance genius is "most characteristically" expressed in tragedy and tragicomedy. Senecan imitation is abandoned for character development. Instead of "monsters of vice," we get real people empathically presented. In *Anthony and Cleopatra* especially "do we feel the tragic clash between competing values in life: the need for emotional fulfillment and the need that the world's work should be done." The tragedies reflect the uncertainty as the comedies the confidence of the Renaissance "in the new life it has created." [Leicester Bradner, "The Rise of Secular Drama in the Renaissance," *Studies in the Renaissance*, III, 1956, 7-22.]

On The Design Of Shakespearean Tragedy

by Harold S. Wilson

This book traces Shakespeare's development as a writer of tragedy by means of a series of comparisons of the plays. In Professor Wilson's view, he continually strove towards a comprehensive and unified tragic interpretation of human life, and in at least two plays, reached this synthesis. In its combination of insight and humane learning, this is a distinguished piece of scholarly criticism.

viii 256 pages $5.00

University of Toronto Press

REVIEW OF PERIODICALS

CONTRIBUTING EDITORS: Ned B. Allen, University of Delaware; Barbara Alden, Geo. Washington Univ.; Nancy Lee Riffe, U. of Ky.; Gordon W. O'Brien, Youngstown Univ.; Peter J. Seng, Northwestern Univ.; Joseph H. Summerell, Columbia Univ. Grad. School; Gordon Ross Smith, Penna. State U., Bibliographer.

THE FIVE-ACT PRINCIPLE

There is a "fairly substantial case," Clifford Leech suggests, for seeing Shakespeare's major plays as "constructed on a five-Act pattern," one which needs some "theatrical indication" to make audiences aware that the whole comprises separate phases. Shakespeare not only "commonly accepted" the five-Act division, but from it "developed several differing dramatic structures." The traditional pattern underlies *Twelfth Night*. *The Merchant of Venice*, however, shows "a clearly-marked Act-division with far less dependence of the traditional pattern." *Titus Andronicus* and *Julius Caesar* are clearly traditional, but *Macbeth*, although resembling them structurally, produces its "deepest effect on us in opposition to that suggested by its Act-structure," that of "the evil and the folly of ambition and unrighteous rule." *Macbeth*, whatever Shakespeare's intention, suggests "a fall . . . symbolic of a general human destruction." In *Othello*, *King Lear*, and *Hamlet*, the five-Act principle "seems apparent," but "this did not lead to an identical structure" in each. Justice demands that by some means, "perhaps by the brief use of music, we indicate the ending of one Act and the beginning of another." ["Shakespeare's Use of a Five-Act Structure," *Die Neueren Sprachen*, Heft 6 (January 1957), 249-63.]

MIDSUMMER NIGHT'S THEME

Paul A. Olson of the Princeton Graduate School sees *A Midsummer Night's Dream* as "a skillfully composed fabric of iconological referents" which realize a Renaissance love philosophy and marriage doctrine. Bottom's thematic observation that "reason and love keep little company together, now a daies (III.i. 147-48)" is justified symbolically. The disparity between reasonable and unreasonable love is represented in the distance from Athens (wisdom) to the woods (error), in the shift from light to darkness, and in the characterizations of Thesus and Hippolita and their fairy counterparts.

Sixteenth century doctrine considered married love as part of the divine love which ordered the universe; well-ordered marriage implied male rule "in the same way that reason was ordained to control both will and passions." This doctrine controls the pattern of the play. Order (Act I) is succeeded by "unbridled passion" (Acts II-III); the play then "returns to a realization of the charity and cohesive community morality in which it began (Acts IV-V)."

Theseus (reason) has mastered Hippolita (passion), but "forgets that divine order is maintained by Divine Love and not by law in any mechanical sense." Oberon, a grace symbol, has lost sovereignty over Titania, symbolizing earthly love. The mythical plot projects "the inner condition of the lovers, . . . the pattern of fall and redemption which they experience." Oberon supernaturally creates concord; Theseus, recognizing "consent as the basis of marriage," rationally restores order. Finally, the tragedy of Pyramus and Thisbe represents "the potential tragedy of the lovers in the woods." Shakespeare's thesis: "a society in which sexual mores are governed well, in which marriage is relatively unselfish, may exhibit a deeper unity in other matters." ["*A Midsummer Night's Dream* and the Meaning of Court Marriage," *ELH*, XXIV:2 (June 1957), 95-119.]

THE SHIELD OF NIGHT

J. H. P. Pafford suggests a new reading—*Shield*—for *Schoole* in *LLL* IV. 3.252 because: (1) Dyce's objection that previously proposed emendations are not similar to parallel words *badge*, *hue* or *crest* does not apply to *Shield;* (2) Shakespeare often speaks of night as a shield or covering (3 *Hen* VI, IV.2.22; *T&C*, IV.2.10; V.8.17; *R&J*, II.2.52, 75, 85; III.2.5; V.3.21; *Mac*, I.5.51; II.4.7-8; *Per*, I.2.81); (3) paleographically *Shield* (esp. *Sheeld*ϙ resembles *Schoole*. ["Schoole of Night," *Notes and Queries*, New Series IV:4 (Apr. '57), 143.]

PARALLELISMS IN FAUST & MACBETH

Whether or not Shakespeare actually had the Faust saga in mind when he wrote *Macbeth*, Henry I. Christ of St. Albans, N. Y., feels that there are many basic parallels between Marlowe's *Dr. Faustus* and *Macbeth*. Both Faust and Macbeth are fertile soil for the seeds of evil, both make a pact with the forces of evil, and both are willing to surrender their souls for temporary gain. Furthermore each of them possesses for a while the goal for which they gave so much. They find their fulfillments ashes in the mouth and die in agony after protracted spiritual torment. ["Macbeth and the Faust Legend," *English Journal*, XLVI:4 (April '57), 212-3.]

The Complete Works of Shakespeare

by Hardin Craig

- a discussion of Shakespeare's life and works.
- illustrations drawn from the Folger and Huntington libraries
- footnotes to complement each poem and play
- selected bibliographies, a 25-page index and a 350-word glossary.

1375 pages $8.00 list

Scott, Foresman and Company

Chicago, Atlanta, Dallas, Palo Alto

Fair Lawn, N. J.

WILL'S WILL

The "dark lady sonnets" and *Lucrece* were written during generally the same period; the exhaustive punning on the poet's name Will (Sonnets 135, 136, and 143) is familiar to all. John E. Parish of Rice Institute believes that another, hitherto unnoted, pun lies in *Lucrece*, 11. 495-7, where Tarquin speaks of his lustful will triumphing over reason. This seems to be "a wry bit of self-appraisal," a rather complacent self-confession to be appreciated by a few of Will's heedful friends. ["Another Pun on 'Will,'" *Notes and Queries*, New Series IV:4 (Apr. '57), 147-8.]

THE TROUBLESOME DATE OF KING JOHN

Although it has been generally agreed that *King John* was written about 1594-6, E.A.J. Honigmann, editor of the new Arden revision of the play, has recently argued that Shakespeare's play preceded the anonymous *Troublesome Reign of King John*, first published 1591. In a new article Robert Adger Law of the University of Texas, concedes that the author of the second play obviously knew the other's work, but feels that *T. R.* was first. *T. R.* was published probably a year or so after it was written. Later editions (1611;; 1622) put "W. Sh." and "W Shakespeare" on the title page, an obvious effort to increase the sales; it is, however, significant that no such atempt was made in 1591. Stylistically *K. J.* reflects greater maturity than *T. R.*, and also than Shakespeare used in any play believed to have been written this early. The characterization of *K. J.* indicates that it followed *T. R.* The structure of *K. J. is* unlike Shakespeare's other histories in which Holinshed was the direct source; Law feels that this is because he was following the structure of *T. R.* which it resembles. Topical allusions in *K. J.* which Honigmann felt pointed to an early date are all found in and could have been taken from *T. R. The* indication that Sinckler played Faulconbridge points to a date after 1594, rather than before. For lack of contrary evidence, Law maintains that *K. J.* followed, and made use of *T. R.* ["On the Date of *King John*," Studies in Philology, LIV:2 (April '57), 119-27.]

THE YELLOW MALADY

Jealousy, the yellow malady (the term is taken from Middleton's *A Fair Quarrel*, II. ii. 12) is an affliction which to A. Bronson Feldman "appears to spring from . . . contempt for the opposite sex." Inherent is an impulse of sadism. The diseased soul "grovels before an idol on [sic] impossible desire, derived from an infantile reverence of father and mother." Incapable of genuine love, it adopts the "pose of the jealous, who affect superiority in imitation of their idols." Shakespeare's purpose in *Othello* was "to portray the ruin of a noble soul. . . . strictly governing the essence of evil in it. The ruin results from the loss of the protagonist's faith in love." In Othello's soul is a "tincture of villainy." From the battle within him between reason and passion (lust), death is the only redemption. Lacking self-knowledge, Othello stakes his life on faith in Desdemona, in a "blind idolatry" which was "intrinsically an insult to human nature." She is "a divinity of his own fantastic creation, fashioned in a revolt from flesh and blood." Iago, as Shakespeare knew, is not "fundamentally" to blame for Othello's fall. He is Othello's "second self, his evil conscience." Othello himself can not believe that Desdemona could love him chastely. The pity of his fall is heightened by the terror of "the locking of his soul together with Iago's forever, by a sacred vow, in erotic hate." ["The Yellow Malady: Short Studies of Five Tragedies of Jealousy," *Literature and Psychology*, VI:2 (May 1956), 38-52.]